

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Revised July 1, 2002**

General plans should be more policy-oriented than regulatory. When viewed as a planning tool to regulate the use of land within unincorporated San Bernardino County, the 1989 General Plan was comprehensive and creative. However, as a policy document used to help establish and guide vision, it lacks the clarity and focus necessary to assist the County decision makers.

The Plan was organized around twenty planning issues that were designed to address the unique challenges confronting San Bernardino County's large and diverse land area and population. Looking back over the last nearly thirteen years, it can be seen that many of the policies and programs in the Plan have worked -- although sometimes with more effort, commitment, and time from staff and other County Officials than should have been necessary -- while other parts of the Plan are inflexible, haven't worked or have been ignored. This report is an evaluation of how successful the General Plan has been in achieving the purpose and goals that were stated at the time it was adopted in 1989. It is being prepared so that the Update of the General Plan that is proposed to begin in the summer of 2002 will start from a solid foundation. The purpose of Phase I of the process is not to "fix" the current General Plan but to identify what needs to be "fixed." Following the completion of Phase I, Phase II will be initiated. Phase II is the Update process for the General Plan.

While the 1989 General Plan was comprehensive, it was also ambitious--as it turns out, too ambitious. Many of the policies and actions that were included in the General Plan were never implemented. Many of the objectives identified with the General Plan when it was adopted, such as the creation of a functioning computerized database and mapping system, never materialized. It was shortly after the General Plan was adopted that the County began to experience severe financial difficulties with the onset of the economic recession that impacted the entire nation. There are literally scores of programs, studies, and action items, which were contemplated in the General Plan that were never addressed due to a lack of funding and/or staffing. Fortunately, none of the programs, studies, and action items that were not implemented is otherwise necessary to meet other statutory requirements of state law.

You will note that the Evaluation Team suggests that a number of the programs, policies and actions that were included in the current Plan, but not implemented, should be dropped rather than considered for inclusion in the Updated General Plan. While the reasons to drop portions of the Plan vary, typically the reasons are that the policies and actions are impractical, unimplementable or simply are not cost effective. Some of these, while perhaps good ideas, were so "pie in the sky" that they received little or no "buy in" or support from any segment of the County. Conversely, other policies/actions and programs that are essential for continuation are suggested for inclusion in the General Plan Update.

The primary goal of this Executive Summary is to provide the reader with a concise list of the recommendations to guide the General Plan Phase II Update. There are two categories of recommendations included in the Executive Summary: Comprehensive Recommendations and Issue Area Recommendations. The first are those that the Evaluation Team believes are essential to guide the Phase II work effort so that a satisfactory General Plan is produced that meets the needs of a dynamic County. Many of these Comprehensive Recommendations are "global" in scope in that they address "big picture" issues. Each recommendation in this grouping is accompanied by sufficient commentary to allow the reader to understand why the recommendation was made.

The second group brings together, in one location, all of the recommendations found within An Analysis of the 1989 General Plan section of this report. This section, as you will note, is a critique on a planning-issue-by-planning-issue basis, of each of the policies and actions found in the existing General Plan. These recommendations are typically narrow in focus. While we believe that the implementation of all of the recommendations will lead to a better General Plan, these recommendations are often less critical than the "big picture" recommendations. These recommendations are not accompanied by commentary in the Executive Summary; however, for additional insight, the reader need only go to the appropriate Issue Area found in Part Two to review the analysis that was prepared.

It is all but certain that a substantial work program and effort will need to be undertaken to revise the Development Code following the Update of the General Plan. The cost and the level of effort that will be required will depend, in large measure, on the scope of change in the General Plan that the Board of Supervisors ultimately selects. As the single most important implementation tool for the General Plan, it is very important that funding consideration for the Development Code be addressed within the overall budgeting allocations for the General Plan Update.

## **COMPREHENSIVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **The Creation of a Vision**

"Vision," once it has been defined, generally agreed upon and adopted, is one of the most powerful tools available to the County to guide rather than to be controlled by current events. Vision, as defined here, is the expression through words and other means (graphs, pictures, charts, etc.) of both what is special about the County and what is yet to be achieved. Vision provides a picture of what the future County should look like and feel like, and what is important to the citizens and the Board of Supervisors, from now through the next twenty years. Vision evolves from the determination at both the individual and group level to have an impact and to make a positive difference--and it requires extensive public participation.

General plans are, foremost, policy documents. In contrast the County's General Plan has served as a land use regulatory tool. The current General Plan fails to provide the visionary guidance that a growing and dynamic County requires. To illustrate, the General Plan and the Development Code both address permitted uses and placement of buildings on property, parking requirements, and similar land use controls. What is not adequately addressed are answers to some of the following questions:

- What kinds of businesses and industries should be encouraged to locate in San Bernardino County? warehousing? manufacturing? assembly? others?
- What are the impact differences that result from different types of business to related County concerns such as job creation, air quality and roadway capacity?
- What land uses best contribute to sustaining a positive economic base for the County?
- Should new or expanding uses be encouraged to take advantage of existing infrastructure and locate in areas where the County encourages redevelopment or take advantage of the workforce in the developing areas of the County that are housing/employee rich but job poor?
- Should policies be considered to protect "special" agricultural, mineral, or recreational "places" in the County from encroachment?

These are but a few of the issues and questions that should be addressed as policies and programs are formulated during the Phase II Update process. It is recognized that, independent of the analysis being conducted in this Phase I of the Update process, some of these types of issues have recently been the focus of a great deal of attention. However, Phase II of the General Plan Update will provide the opportunity to consider them within the broad context of an overall County planning effort. A common vision among decision makers, citizens, and staff will allow resources to be more effectively harnessed and opportunities more readily seized, so that decisions are made consistent with clear goals.

*Recommendation 1: A Vision Statement for the County should be prepared as a preamble to the General Plan and it should be embodied throughout the goals and policies of the adopted Plan. Each goal and policy that is being considered for inclusion in the Updated General Plan should help, in some way, achieves the "Vision" of the County. Otherwise, it should be discarded. The preparation of a Vision Statement should be conducted with the extensive participation of individuals and stakeholder groups and the process should go to extraordinary lengths to capture as much diversity as possible.*

### Public Participation

The Evaluation Team conducted two study sessions, both open to the public, with the County Planning Commission. During the study sessions, the Commission made very strong statements regarding the high level of importance they placed on public participation and their preference to see an inclusive and far-reaching public participation

program. Active citizen participation and a comprehensive public participation process throughout the update of the General Plan will provide the best opportunity of achieving a relevant General Plan that has the support of County residents (including other public jurisdictions, special interest groups and the business community). The participation process should utilize techniques that are designed to inform the public, early in the process, that the General Plan Update is underway. Further, it should permit and facilitate easy accessibility and input into the process. It must be designed so as to allow consideration of multiple points of view yet have a legitimate system of bringing issues and policies to a reasonable conclusion.

Efforts should include reaching out to special interest groups, to engage the various geographical parts of the County through meetings in locations convenient to where people live, to involve people in the development of a vision and its implementation, etc. Participation processes can become expensive. The geographic distances and diversity of people, interests and issues in the County will require that the public participation program be carefully designed so that the most impact is received for the dollar spent. There are literally hundreds of options and methods available to inform and/or gain public input. Just a few would include, a web site, project newsletters, telephone hotlines, focus groups, outreach to civic and special interest groups, special committees, using the mass media including newspapers and radio and television, charrettes, open houses, surveys, bulletin boards at libraries and other public areas, booths at fairs and other public gatherings, and the options go on and on.

Regardless of the combination of methods that are ultimately selected to shape the public participation program for the Update, the recommendation below lists three components that should be included as the essential core of the program.

*Recommendation 2: Establish a public participation program centered on four essential components:*

- *A General Plan Advisory Committee consisting of a sufficient number of people to capture the diversity of the County, but not so many as to “bog down” the effectiveness and progress of the committee (approximately 15-21 members). The Committee members should be appointed by the Board of Supervisors, as a body rather than individually, and should reflect the social, business, political, and environmental diversity of the County.*
- *A General Plan Update website linked through the County's website on which information can be posted and received.*
- *An extensive public meeting program that reaches out geographically into the County at convenient locations and at convenient times such as early evenings.*
- *Create a framework that encourages ongoing input and participation by the major stakeholder and special interest groups throughout the County.*

## The Organization of the 1989 General Plan

Organizationally, the policy direction of the 1989 General Plan is found in the twenty subsections entitled Planning Issues, where each of the subsections focuses on a planning issue. Each of the planning issues is well developed and includes goals, policies and action items that more fully expand upon the planning issue. Together, the twenty subsections form the General Plan. These are presented in the same order and under the same headings as they appear in the General Plan text. This is a rather non-typical organization and presentation approach. State law mandates that there be at least seven elements in any general plan. Those seven elements are land use, circulation, housing, open space, conservation, safety and noise. All of these mandatory elements are addressed in the County's General Plan. However, while most general plans are physically divided into the seven elements (chapters), the County's General Plan has parts of the seven elements dispersed throughout the twenty subsections. The expectation of the authors of the 1989 Plan was that the approach would better focus attention on the planning issues facing the County. In reality, the organizational structure has made the General Plan more difficult to use and to find what one is looking for, particularly for the occasional user.

Recommendation 3 below suggests an organizational structure that is typical of that found and used by most jurisdictions. It is familiar to professionals as well as less complicated for the occasional user. It results in a clearer understanding and, therefore, better implementation of County policies.

*Recommendation 3: Organize the General Plan into the seven mandatory elements and any additional elements the County may wish to add.*

## The Volume of the Document

The General Plan is based on solid planning, however, its complexity and volume diminishes its effectiveness. The challenging organizational format discussed above, when added to the sheer bulk of the Plan, combine to make it difficult to use for planning professionals let alone the general public. Unless one is a frequent user of the General Plan, such as a planning commissioner or a staff member who routinely processes development applications, it is intimidating. It is cluttered with hundreds of policies leaving an unclear picture of what is the preferred focus and direction of the County. Unnecessarily adding to the bulk of the document are trail standards, endangered species lists, lists of public access points to recreational areas, and similar types of lists and discussions that are useful but not appropriate in a general plan. Its less than clear organization, its references to other programs that may or may not exist, and its lack of clear wording have reduced the County's ability to benefit from the good planning work that was done to prepare the General Plan.

Recommendation 4 below is intended to create a General Plan that is both less wordy as well as driven by tightly drawn policies and actions. The Updated General Plan provides the opportunity and the challenge for the County to precisely state its "vision" for the future and to articulate through policies and actions how it will achieve the vision.

*Recommendation 4: Reduce the volume of the General Plan to a more manageable size through a number of techniques, including but not limited to the following methods:*

- *Remove the technical standards and guidelines from the current General Plan that are neither policies nor actions. In many cases, these parts of the General Plan, for example the trail standards, do clearly belong in a County document, but not in the General Plan.*
- *Consider each policy and action that is proposed as part of the Update and require that it clearly contribute toward achieving the County's Vision (see Recommendation 1). Eliminate those that fail to do so.*
- *Eliminate policies and actions that state that the County should implement or enforce another legislative act, for example, vehicular noise levels.*
- *Eliminate portions of the Plan where County authority is superceded by another agency.*

### Staff Participation

One of the findings that became apparent during the Phase I evaluation was that while the staff in many of the County departments and divisions are implementing policies found in the General Plan, the policies are being implemented not due to the guidance and direction found in the General Plan, but for other reasons. For example, the implementing staff states that a program is designed to comply with a requirement, such as a state law and, in fact, they are unfamiliar that there even are relevant policies in the General Plan. This is evidence that the General Plan may not be as organizationally relevant as it should be. As the most visible and important policy document of the County regarding development, and one which is designed to focus the County's resources, a lack of "big picture" awareness is likely to dilute the County's effectiveness to achieve its goals. With this in mind, measures to ensure the participation in the development of the General Plan and its implementation by the County organization must be a priority in the Update process. This issue was discussed by the Planning Commission. The Commission was supportive and went further, suggesting that a public member be invited to participate with the Staff Advisory Committee, thereby guaranteeing public scrutiny throughout the Update process.

*Recommendation 5: A General Plan Staff Advisory Committee of the highest level should be formed under the direction of the County Chief Administrative Officer to provide input and guidance throughout the preparation of the Updated General Plan.*

## The One-Map System

One of the more creative aspects of the current General Plan and development process is the use of the "one-map" system. Most jurisdictions use a two-map system -- one to designate general plan land uses and a second for zoning classifications. The "one map" approach permits the use of a single map on which is shown both General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications. The one-map approach assures that there will always be land use consistency between the County's General Plan and its Zoning Code.

Valid criticisms of the one-map system are that it is more inflexible and restrictive than the two-map system, and that it necessitates a General Plan amendment each time the zoning of a parcel(s) is changed. Nonetheless, without the availability of a parcel specific Geographic Information System, and given the large size and the complexity of the County, the one-map approach is a rational method to map County land use designations. It permits a greater level of accuracy and consistency between the General Plan and zoning than would be possible with a traditional two-map approach that does not include a parcel-specific delineation. In the view of the Evaluation Team, the single map should be retained within the updated General Plan.

We believe that there are modifications that could be made to the current system that would increase the County's ability to respond in an environmentally sensitive manner to development opportunities more quickly while retaining the one-map system. Opportunities to improve the current constraints should be evaluated during the Phase II Update.

*Recommendation 6: Retain the one map system. Evaluate alternatives that are designed to reduce the number of General Plan amendments that are necessitated solely due to changes in zoning classifications.*

## The Preparation of a Comprehensive Computerized Database and Mapping System

Perhaps the most frequently mentioned observation that is raised throughout this evaluation is the need for a comprehensive computerized database. This database needs to include the ability to identify information as it relates to specific parcels. The numerous uses for this planning tool and the inefficiencies that result because it is not available are subjects of discussion in nearly every section of this report. The best overall analysis is found later in this report in the section entitled An Assessment of the Mapping System. A brief discussion is also presented here.

An enormous amount of land-based information is utilized by the County Planning Division. The list of information includes General Plan and Zoning land use designations; infrastructure/Improvement Levels needed to support development; hazards affecting property, such as flood, fire safety, noise, geologic (seismic and landslide), and aviation safety areas; natural resources including biological and mineral resources; transportation/circulation; etc. This information is fifteen or more years old and has not

been maintained in the County Geographic Information Management System (GIMS). As subdivisions and changes occur, they have largely been maintained on manually prepared maps. Furthermore, none of this data was created on a base system that will be readily compatible with the base system that the County intends to utilize for its parcel based Geographic Information System (GIS). Conversion of the existing electronic data is likely to be more costly and time consuming than recreating the data in a compatible format and on a compatible base map. The existing information cannot be easily retrieved, is not always accurately applied or consistently interpreted, and, for certain data, is not available for some geographical locations of the County in an electronic format. Much of the information is not accessible to the public except by a request submitted through the County staff. Information is manually retrieved, which requires considerable staff time and frequently results in significant delays to members of the public in obtaining information. Planning information regarding Natural Resources Overlays that is needed by the public to properly prepare development applications for subsequent submittal to the County for staff review is even less accessible. It is typically not secured until after an actual application is filed with the County.

The existing methods used to access, store and retrieve data are largely manual and are inefficient and unsatisfactory. The situation will only become more aggravated as the demand for more and more easily accessible data increases due to economic development needs, continued population growth and the consumption of land in the County, the number of environmental issues affecting property escalates, and the demand for more efficient County services continues. While unfortunately it won't be completed within the timeframe contemplated for the General Plan Update, the County is currently considering the preparation of a comprehensive Geographic Information System (GIS) – Parcel Base Map that has been proposed by the Information Services Department. This proposal also includes the conversion of hardware and software so that all information can be made more accessible. If implemented, this will be a major step leading to the automation of planning information. Ultimately, planning and land use information could be searched, analyzed and retrieved by Assessor's Parcel Number, address, or name of owner by individual planners and via the Internet or without visiting County offices as is now required. However, planning and land use information will need to be prepared in a format that is compatible with the proposed Geographic Information System Parcel Base Maps so that it may be added once the maps are prepared.

A significant component of the General Plan Update will involve the development and completion of overlay maps (layers) that provide the range of geographic information that is necessary to support the planning and environmental impact assessments and to better define the Hazards and Resources overlay designations that are required by the County's General Plan. This mapping program should be initiated at the outset of the General Plan Update. While an overlay mapping program is independent from the Parcel Base Map proposed by the Information Services Department, it needs to be compatible with the proposed Geographic Information System Parcel Base Maps. Data will need to be collected in ESRI-based GIS format, for California State Plane Zone 5 NAD 83. Up-to-date base maps of the entire County will be needed, with a variety of data layers that provide specific sets of information concerning natural and cultural resources,



environmental and health hazards, the transportation network, existing land use patterns, land use plans, water, sewer and storm drainage systems, and various public services. As noted in two other narratives prepared for Phase I (Assessment of the General Plan Maps and Master Environmental Assessment), the existing General Plan Overlay Maps are inadequate for the purposes of the General Plan Update, with respect to both the General Plan Elements and the General Plan Environmental Impact Report. There are serious deficiencies with respect to data currency, accuracy, scope of geographic coverage, outdated mapping formats (some maps are not yet in electronic format) and ability to obtain desired information in a timely fashion. The Natural Resources Overlay, in particular, needs substantial work to compile missing information concerning a variety of important biological resources, update existing maps, and transform this information into a format that is compatible with the proposed Geographic Information System Parcel Base Maps. Similar efforts will be required for the other Overlay Maps, although the amount of work needed to fill data gaps and create appropriate GIS files will vary.

It is our understanding that aerial photos are likely to be prepared for the entire County that will be compatible with the proposed GIS. This could serve as an outstanding base for the various overlay maps. Compilation of the overlay information in an ESRI-based GIS format, for California State Plane Zone 5 NAD 83 will ultimately allow integration of the information, with the GIS proposed by the Information Services Department, so that it can be searched, analyzed and retrieved by Assessor's Parcel Number, address, or owner. Thus, the overlay maps would be fully compatible with the Parcel Base Maps and no redundancy would occur.

*Recommendation 7: As part of the General Plan update the County should:*

- 7a. Use the aerial photo database being developed within the County as a base map that will be compatible with the proposed Geographic Information System (GIS) – Parcel Base Maps. As one of the initial steps of the General Plan Update, compile overlay maps (layers) in a GIS compatible format (ESRI-based GIS format, for California State Plane Zone 5 NAD 83) that provide information that is necessary to support planning and environmental impact assessments and to better define Hazards and Resources overlay designations.*
- 7b. Use the proposed Geographic Information System Parcel Base Maps from the Information Services Department when completed and the overlay maps (layers) as building blocks for the future completion of a fully integrated Geographic Information System that is capable of being queried and is searchable by Assessors Parcel Number, address and owner by individual users, including the public. Land Use and Improvement Level designation layers will also need to be added to the Geographic Information System Parcel Base Maps once completed to develop a system that is fully usable by the Land Use Services Department and the public.*

## The Designation of Responsibility for and Implementation of Policies and Actions in the General Plan

Throughout the General Plan, there are numerous policies and actions that require "someone" to do "something" in order for the policy or action to be implemented. Typically, however, the policy or action is presented without responsibility for its implementation being assigned to any department, division, or a position of the County. The result, as one would expect, is that implementation often does not occur. A lack of assigned responsibility was one of the most frequently cited reasons for a significant portion of the General Plan not being implemented.

*Recommendation 8: To the extent feasible, require that all policies and actions adopted as part of the Updated General Plan identify a responsible entity for implementation. This recommendation recognizes that not all policies and actions lend themselves to the identification of a specific party, department or agency responsible for implementation. However, most do. Therefore, the assignment of responsibility should be a major consideration during the framing of policies and actions for the Updated General Plan.*

## Economic Development Element as an Optional Element in the General Plan

Economic Development is an important aspect the County's long-range plans. An Economic Development Element in a General Plan can afford a marriage between fiscal health and sound planning principles. A recurring theme expressed by staff and others during the evaluation process was the absence of an economic development strategy within the General Plan to bring together the County's substantial but finite resources and the County's efforts in ways that guide decisions about land use and capital facilities. An Economic Development Element should recognize the interrelationship between economic expansion and employment opportunities and other considerations. These include, but are certainly not limited to, adequate circulation and transportation resources, the availability of housing which is both affordable and meets the amenity expectations of the workforce, the need to create educational opportunities to meet the demand for an increasingly skilled workforce, and the geographic differences and sub-economies that exist in the County.

The County, particularly during the last several years, has been devoting time and energy to the development of several of the strategies/components that would be incorporated into an Economic Development Element. The County, through an Economic Development Element, should capitalize on this work, expand on it where necessary and reinforce the planning process as a part of an economic development strategy.

One of the subsequent recommendations focuses on the County's role in the Region. The Evaluation Team believes that there are both internal and external concerns that the County should consider relative to how it influences and is influenced by others. These concerns have implications in regard to implementation of a successful economic

development strategy (Please see below the discussion entitled Collaboration on Regional Issues).

*Recommendation 9: As part of the Phase II Update of the General Plan, the County should prepare and adopt an Economic Development Element.*

### Collaboration on Regional Issues

Since the adoption of the 1989 General Plan, the County has typically focused on its role as a provider of local governmental services rather than its role as a provider of regional governmental services especially in planning and transportation areas. The County is no longer “adjacent to” the Los Angeles area. It is inextricably linked to adjacent counties and the region with respect to land use and transportation issues. Regional policies in these areas will profoundly affect the County and vice versa. The County is part of an area that has seen the highest job growth in Southern California in the last ten years. Socioeconomic factors, including jobs-housing balance and related issues, are critically important for the County as they have major implications for transportation infrastructure needs and continued economic development. These regional issues that the County needs to address in the near future for continued economic development include:

- Socioeconomic Forecasts (jobs/housing balance) for the Regional Transportation Plan Update
- Regional Transportation Plan Update, which includes highways, airports, railroads, and transit services
- Growth of the Ontario Airport and its impacts in the region
- The redevelopment of the former Norton and George air bases
- Significantly increased rail and truck traffic, especially relating to the development of the Alameda Corridor and the increases in Pacific Rim trade
- Air Quality attainment plans
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan
- SCAG upcoming visioning process
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
- Regional Water Quality Control Plans and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements

In several areas, State Law indicates specific regional responsibilities for Counties to fulfill with respect to all the jurisdictions within the County, including:

- Preparation of Solid Waste Management Plans
- Airport land use planning
- Formation of a Congestion Management Agency and Preparation of Congestion Management Plans--Congestion Management Plans are required to link land use, transportation, and air quality concerns

All of these issues directly and significantly impact the County. While it could be argued that these are “regional” issues for SANBAG to deal with, the reality is that they affect the whole County, including County lands. Furthermore, the County is the most significant member of SANBAG and can provide the direction and leadership to address these issues. The other reality is that County land use and transportation policies also affect the “regional” transportation system.

While the County Circulation Element is not the same as the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), they are and should be closely related. The County Circulation Element needs to be developed within the overall context of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Correspondingly, the Circulation Element should provide significant input and direction into the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. At this point, SANBAG has not completed a Comprehensive Transportation Plan for San Bernardino County.

San Bernardino County lags behind other counties in the region in the planning and development of countywide transportation systems. We believe these issues will only become more critical for the County to address in the future, particularly in order for San Bernardino County to be competitive with other counties for transportation infrastructure financing. These other counties will be much more favorably positioned for scarce funds because of their countywide planning efforts.

It is therefore recommended that the County play a much more significant role in supporting and working with SANBAG in the development of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (including strategies, policies and programs), in understanding and addressing the implications of County policies on the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and in ensuring that the County Circulation Element is consistent with and supportive of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

In recent years, considerable attention has been focused on environmental issues, particularly the protection of threatened and endangered species. Southern California especially has been the focus of much of this attention, both because of the amounts of habitat, diversity, and number of species in this area and the pace and amount of development that is occurring. San Bernardino County should consider a more proactive posture in developing environmental strategies to support and maintain economic and infrastructure development. One of the more contemporary approaches commonly employed in California is the preparation of regional Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plans (MSHCP). These plans are controversial and problematic at best. The County is currently taking the lead in preparing a regional MSHCP for the Valley Region and is also participating in the preparation of the West Mojave Regional Conservation Plan in the Desert Region. However, due to the uncertainty associated with the completion and adoption of these plans, the County should also entertain the use of a more conventional approach in General Plan preparation by incorporating alternative strategies in the Conservation and Open Space Elements. If San Bernardino County does not move forward with some form of comprehensive habitat conservation program, environmental

activists will likely increase their efforts to restrain growth to the potential detriment of economic development and infrastructure funding. The first focus of a conservation program should be in the Valley Region where growth pressures are strongest and where sensitive species are most concentrated.

With these various regional plans and issues, it is suggested that San Bernardino County should consider, as part of its efforts in updating the General Plan, their potential role as a provider of regional governmental services in addition to their role as a provider of local governmental services. The County already has a significant regional role in public health and public safety and should consider its potential role in the areas of land use, transportation, and environmental issues. As discussed above and in other sections there is a definite linkage and mandated consideration of land use with transportation, air quality, water quality, mineral resources, and other natural resources, and environmental issues, especially the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered biological resources.

Recommendation 10:

- 10a. In order to continue the pace of economic development and adequately compete for transportation infrastructure funds, the County needs to take a leadership role in SANBAG in the development of comprehensive transportation strategies, policies, and programs and a Comprehensive Transportation Plan for the entire County.*
- 10b. To reduce federal and state regulatory constraints on economic development and to adequately compete for federal and state transportation infrastructure funds, the County needs to develop and implement a strategy for conservation of sensitive biological resources. The conservation strategy could be an implementation mechanism that is part of a broader conservation strategy defined in updated Conservation and/or Open Space Elements of the General Plan.*

Land Use Planning in Spheres of Influence

Spheres of Influence are established on the principles of joint cooperation and participation to create logical land use and service plans for the affected areas. Relative to San Bernardino County, the "affected areas" are the unincorporated land areas surrounding the incorporated cities, which at some point in time are expected to be annexed to the cities. Spheres of Influence are intended to play important roles in promoting logical, orderly and financially efficient growth within the County and the affected cities. Within the County's General Plan, land use planning in Spheres of Influence areas is addressed in Section II-D-6 (b) iii and suggests coordination between the County, cities, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), and their respective Service Agencies.

The County policies and proposed changes regarding Spheres of Influence have recently been the subject of some controversy between cities and the County. In an effort to facilitate better coordination and participation, the State adopted AB2838, which

mandates the periodic review of services in each sphere of influence in the County every five (5) years. The periodic reviews by LAFCO will provide opportunity for agencies to review and discuss land use planning, services, and County policy issues.

*Recommendation 11: During Phase II, conduct comparative studies of city and County Land Use Plans to use as a basis for reviews of alternative growth scenarios. Use the LAFCO upcoming reviews of Spheres of Influence as a forum for County, service agencies, cities, and LAFCO to initiate discussions of policy issues regarding intergovernmental coordination and cooperation between agencies and include revised policies in the General Plan Update.*

### The Link between Land Use and Transportation

As the development of available land continues, and as the financing of infrastructure becomes more difficult, it has become increasingly important to consider the close relationship between land use and transportation. This is because different land use development configurations with respect to geographic location, type of use, and density, can have profound implications on transportation infrastructure needs.

In conducting an update of the County's General Plan, there is a critical need to conduct an analysis of the ability of the County's planned transportation system to support the planned County land uses. An analysis such as this has not been conducted for at least thirteen years. This analysis will be able to either verify that the planned circulation system is adequate or allow the identification of where changes and/or upgrades to the circulation system may be necessary. In addition, it will enable a better understanding of the relationship between the County's land uses and land uses in incorporated areas, the transportation implications of such relationships, and an assessment of the potential impact of County land use policies on the broader transportation infrastructure in the County. It will also provide the ability to evaluate the effects of alternate County land use patterns, configurations, or densities on transportation infrastructure needs. It will provide a sound and defensible basis for meeting the state requirement that general plans demonstrate that the Circulation Element is consistent with and supports the Land Use Element.

This does not require creation of a new traffic forecasting model. Rather, the process would involve using the existing SCAG subregional travel forecasting model for San Bernardino County to forecast traffic volumes on County roads for the assumed General Plan land uses and/or alternatives. This model may need modifications and/or enhancements, particularly in the High Desert areas, to add the necessary detail to adequately conduct these evaluations.

### Recommendation 12:

- 12a. Conduct an analysis of 2025 forecast traffic volumes related to County land uses to determine transportation infrastructure needs in the County and to confirm that the circulation system will support the County land use policies. Use the existing SCAG subregional model, with enhancements to the model*

*process where necessary to adequately investigate circulation needs in the County areas.*

- 12b. Use the results of the analysis to modify the Circulation Element where necessary to ensure that an adequate County transportation infrastructure will be provided in the future to support the County Land Use Plan.*
- 12c. Using the results and understanding gained from this analysis, the County should develop a leadership role in supporting SANBAG in developing Countywide transportation strategies, policies and programs and a Countywide Transportation Plan.*

### Revisions to the Infrastructure and Improvement Level System

The County utilizes the Infrastructure/Improvement Level system described in the General Plan to define the types and level of improvements for roads and other capital improvements (drainage, water, and wastewater facilities) required for development. Improvement Levels range from Improvement Level 1 in urban areas with parcel sizes less than one-half acre to Improvement Level 5 in very rural areas with minimum lot sizes of greater than twenty acres. The system is intended to ensure that an adequate level of infrastructure improvement is provided to support development.

The structure and implementation of this Improvement Level system need to be analyzed to determine if adequate infrastructure is being provided to support current development as well as to ensure that adequate infrastructure is constructed to support future development. Improvement Level 3 areas and some other areas that are in transition from rural to urban need to be reviewed, especially in the Desert Regions of the County. The Improvement Level 3 areas often are characterized by a significant amount of low to moderate density residential development or larger parcels that potentially could be subdivided to higher densities. At the time of the 1989 General Plan Update, these areas were expected to convert to smaller lots or higher density development in five to ten years. It has now been thirteen years since the preparation of the 1989 General Plan. These areas should be reviewed for potential need to require higher improvement levels (Improvement Levels 1 and 2). The standards and criteria for exemptions and exceptions to improvement requirements should also be reviewed.

The Improvement Level system allows for exemptions or exceptions, such as a waiver of paved access and drainage improvements where a Subregional Facilities Plan and a fee or other financing mechanism exists to provide improvements. However, the Subregional Facilities Plans and fees are typically predicated only upon improvement of major roads. If the area remains rural, this may be acceptable. However, if an area transitions to higher density, then the waiver of these improvements with payment of a fee that is based on the provision of major roads means that local roads and other improvements may be missing, creating infrastructure gaps in areas of higher density development. Such infrastructure gaps may discourage further development due to higher costs required to catch up on needed infrastructure or, alternatively, areas may be viewed as less desirable.

Some of the existing Subregional Facilities Plans are quite large, encompassing more than 130 square miles. An alternative and perhaps more comprehensive approach to addressing Subregional Facilities Plans would be to include them as part of the development of Community Plans. It may also be appropriate to review the development standards and a base level of backbone improvements in addition to roads that would be supported by fees or other financing mechanisms consistent with the major regions in the County (Valley, Mountain, and Desert). In addition to backbone improvements, a frequent concern of residents is availability and access of emergency services, including fire and paramedic services. Therefore, as part of the development of Community Plans, it is recommended that emergency services also be included in the preparation of plans and fees.

Recommendation 13:

- 13a. Review the standards for Improvement Levels relating to exemptions, especially for paved roads, to ensure that these standards are adequate to provide necessary infrastructure to support development, both immediate and long-term.*
- 13b. Review the development Improvement Standards as they relate to different circumstances for the County's Geographic Regions (Valley, Mountain, and Desert).*
- 13c. Provide a stronger link between the regional or backbone transportation/circulation and infrastructure needed as a result of development and the adequacy of the funding of Subregional Facilities Plans.*
- 13d. Include infrastructure, services, and financing plans as an integral part of site specific planning and the preparation of any Community Plans.*

Community Plans

Community Plans emerged as the collective vision of the local area residents and stakeholders for guiding development in the unincorporated County areas with distinct community identities. In the past, unincorporated communities without the fiscal ability to incorporate as their own city have sought to preserve their community character and spirit through these plans. The 1989 Update proposed that comprehensive plans be incorporated into the General Plan and Development Code, but full incorporation was not completed due to budget and staff constraints.

The County should reinstate the Community Plan program. These plans can fulfill their original intent of providing guidance for development in these communities with the strength of authority that comes from being a part of the General Plan and Development Code. As part of the Phase II Update, objective criteria should be established that would identify candidate areas on the basis of population, unique character or qualities of the area, a vision for the development of the area, and a solid constituent base that can participate in creating the Community Plans. These candidate areas will most likely include the areas that had completed Community Plans or plans that were being prepared at the time of the 1989 General Plan Update. While the 1989 list of 14 Community Plan



areas has shrunk due to incorporations over the years, those remaining areas with Community Plans already created may be able to kick-off the process by having their existing plans updated to reflect the changes that have occurred over the years. In some cases, the changes that will be required to update or complete these pre-existing plans could be extensive.

The consultant selected to undertake the Update will be required to prepare three approaches (including costs) to address the completion of Community Plans. The approaches should range from a policy-oriented plan to more comprehensive approaches that might include distinctive development standards, review processes, or other features designed to capture or retain community uniqueness. The three approaches should also consider if the pre-1989 Community Plans can be used and built upon or if they should be completely updated.

It is recommended that every Community Plan include implementation and finance plans. Timing of implementation and the fiscal impact of executing the plans should be an integral part of shaping the plans so that responsibility is clearly defined, and that community members and the County understand how the goals of the plan are to be attained.

Recommendation 14:

- 14a. The concept of Community Plans should be readopted.*
- 14b. In order to consistently analyze the need to create a new or revise a pre-existing Community Plan, the County should establish objective criteria that would identify candidate areas on the basis of population, unique character or qualities of the area, and a solid constituent base that can participate in creating the Community Plans as part of the Phase II Update.*
- 14c. Timing of implementation, the fiscal impact of execution, and identification of infrastructure requirements should be an integral part of shaping each Community Plan. This step is critical so that responsibility for providing services, and the source of funding new infrastructure and/or improvements to existing systems is clearly defined, and community members and the County understand how the goals of the plan are to be attained.*
- 14d. Three alternative levels of effort for preparing Community Plans including the costs and time associated with each alternative level are to be prepared by the consultant selected to complete the General Plan Update. The County intends to select an alternative after the reviewing the consultant's analysis.*

Revisions to the Development Code

It is virtually certain that following (or in concert with) the Update of the General Plan that significant revisions to the Development Code will need to occur. The changes will be necessary in order to implement revisions to the General Plan that are expected to be adopted as part of the Update process. While we do not anticipate a need for wholesale revision to the Development Code, we do expect significant modifications.

*Recommendation 15: Allocate funds to revise the Development Code and schedule revisions to the Development Code as part of the overall General Plan Update process.*

### Land Use Revisions

In most geographical areas of the County, the existing land use designations, when complemented with the policy direction found in the General Plan and the standards of the Development Code, function reasonably well. From the outset of this General Plan Update, it was not anticipated that a wholesale evaluation of the existing land uses or alterations to the mix of land uses was warranted. However, there are several areas in the County where the current land-use designations and the relationship of existing uses is incompatible. By way of example, some locations in the West Fontana area are impacted by an inefficient pattern of industrial, commercial and residential uses that has emerged over the years due to a lack of effective planning and land use control. These areas, and other areas which are similarly impacted, often suffer from a lack of cohesiveness, a reluctance of the private sector to invest in the area, aesthetic deterioration and maintenance deterioration, and other factors. A comprehensive analysis of some "hot spot" or candidate areas is necessary and should be initiated as part of the Phase II Update. The focus should be geographically broad enough to allow for creation or preservation of viable residential areas and industrial areas.

*Recommendation 16: Early in the Phase II General Plan Update process identify those areas where an analysis of existing land use/zoning designations is warranted and undertake a process, including local participation groups, to change land uses as warranted to facilitate the implementation of County goals. Candidate sites would be selected on the basis of criteria such as number of General Plan Amendment requests within the last three years, number of noise and traffic complaints received, number of code compliance citations issues, and similar criteria.*

### Assess Impacts Associated with Growth Patterns

In the 1989 General Plan EIR, the environmental impacts associated with projected levels of growth anticipated through the Year 2010 were evaluated in a highly qualitative manner, without the benefit of any mapping to illustrate the physical manifestations of that growth with respect to likely on-the-ground changes. As a result, the EIR was unable to provide useful information concerning the consequences of the likely growth patterns with respect to the specific characteristics of any particular area, and did not provide any comparison of ground-level impacts associated with alternative growth scenarios. Different growth patterns translate into differing impacts to the natural environment as well as differing needs for transportation, water, sewer and storm drainage facilities, and various public services.

For example, potential impacts to sensitive wildlife habitat and other important natural resources cannot be quantified or geographically defined without mapping that provides the ability to overlay development patterns onto a base map that illustrates the spatial extent of the resources of concern. Development pattern overlays are necessary to compare the impacts of one growth scenario versus another; for example, to compare a low-density sprawl pattern to a pattern that preserves more open space by clustering development intensities into selected areas. Forecasts of locations and intensities of future land uses are also necessary to determine infrastructure needs and public services demands, and to compare such needs/demands between alternative growth scenarios. The locations, mix and intensity of land uses are the primary determinants in the sizing and location of physical infrastructure. For example, mapping of projected land uses and their intensities is necessary to allow for an analysis of the adequacy of existing and planned roadways to carry the volumes of traffic that would be generated by that land use pattern. This same kind of land use mapping and projection of demand is required to estimate water supply and wastewater treatment system needs.

A comprehensive assessment of alternative growth scenarios that accurately compares traffic impacts, air quality impacts, public services and utilities demand, impacts to natural resources and other indicators of quality of life such as jobs/housing balance, would require the preparation of maps illustrating alternative growth patterns as overlays onto maps of existing conditions. Mapping and analysis of alternative growth patterns is therefore recommended as part of the next General Plan Update, to provide important information in the development of updated General Plan elements, and to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Recommendation 17:

- 17a. Create a Countywide base mapping system to illustrate existing conditions, with significant cultural and geographic landmarks highlighted to provide widely accepted locational references. An aerial photography-based system is recommended; perhaps this could be developed from the set of aerial photos to be prepared by the County in the next few months.*
- 17b. Update and complete the General Plan Overlay Maps, utilizing the new Countywide base maps described above.*
- 17c. Create a series of overlay maps to illustrate alternative growth scenarios, including the existing General Plan Land Use Element, and other alternatives to be developed as part of the General Plan Update and the General Plan EIR.*
- 17d. Develop a set of analysis criteria by which to measure and compare the environmental consequences associated with alternative growth scenarios.*
- 17e. Consider the comparative environmental effects of each growth scenario during development of the Updated General Plan.*

Master Environmental Assessment (MEA)

Among the data management systems that were targeted for completion and incorporation into the 1989 General Plan was a Master Environmental Assessment

(MEA). The MEA was intended to be a dynamic, i.e. updatable, database that would provide a detailed description of existing conditions, methods of calculating impacts upon resources and potential policies and mitigations to be utilized to lessen negative impacts. As a dynamic data system, the MEA could be used to support and monitor the General Plan implementation and simplify future project-level environmental reviews. The initial description of existing conditions was to be compiled from the various background reports that were developed for the General Plan Update program. A variety of computerized maps were to be prepared to illustrate key environmental resources and constraints throughout the county; these maps could be used as overlays in combination with other base maps to aid in the evaluation of area plans and project level plans. Unfortunately, due to funding constraints, an MEA was not completed following adoption of the revised General Plan and development of an MEA has not been included in any efforts to update the County's planning support systems since then.

The need for a comprehensive environmental database management system (EDMS) is as strong today as it was in 1989. To improve the ability to evaluate the variety of environmental, infrastructure, and public services issues that will occur in conjunction with the existing and future growth pressures in the County's three regions, some form of an electronic, GIS-based EDMS will be required. As discussed in the separate reports entitled "Assessment of General Plan Maps" and "Programs Recommended but not Implemented," the Evaluation Team is recommending that all of the Overlay Maps identified in the existing General Plan, along with a number of additional data layers, be updated/completed in electronic format, in a manner that is compatible with the mapping protocol of the County's Geographic Information Management System (GIMS). If the overlay maps are successfully and completely updated as recommended, there will be no need to create additional base maps for the purpose of an MEA.

The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared in Phase II will address long-term, area wide cumulative impacts, in each major region of the County and in various portions of each region. Programmatic mitigation measures will be included in the General Plan EIR and the accompanying Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to address those impacts, and additional mitigation measures will likely be identified to guide mitigation strategies for project-level and plan-level projects that are proposed subsequent to adoption of the General Plan. An MEA is not required, therefore, for those analytical purposes.

While countywide or regional MEAs would be beneficial planning tools, they are not required by law, are unnecessary and could not be properly completed until an effective base mapping system is in place. For Phase II, therefore, we strongly recommend that development and completion of a base mapping system be assigned a high priority. Development of additional planning and analytical applications, possibly including MEAs, could occur in subsequent general plan amendments, or perhaps as a component of an overall California Environmental Quality Act streamlining effort.

*Recommendation 18: Develop a countywide, electronic environmental database system, with integrated data layers that support the General Plan Update program now, which can be linked to a parcel-based GIS program in the future. As an MEA is not feasible at this time, the database program will be used as a building block for the collection of information to eliminate redundant analysis in future applications. (see also Recommendations 7a and 7b).*

## **ISSUE AREA RECOMMENDATIONS**

The 1989 General Plan Update divided the important planning issues facing San Bernardino County into 20 issue areas. These issue areas are analyzed at length in Part II of this report. Each analysis contains:

- a matrix outlining recommendations for action on each policy and action
- a narrative containing a summary of findings
- a discussion of the findings, and
- a list of recommendations

We have included the specific recommendations here, in the Executive Summary, to create a complete list of recommendations for the General Plan Update.

### **Geologic Recommendations**

- *Implement the GIMS program or other parcel-based automated information system and clearly establish the process by which Geologic data will be collected, captured and retrieved by the program*
- *Identify and create better links between the various sections (Elements) of the General Plan that address similar issues from different focal points*
- *Develop more coordination between the County Geologist, other County departments, and other agencies, especially Transportation, Flood, and Solid Waste, to ensure that geologic considerations are accounted for in the siting and approval of structures*
- *Implement the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act with consideration for both safety and flexibility of use or application*

### **Flood Recommendation**

- *During the Phase II Update of the General Plan, all proposed policies and actions should be evaluated for consistency with existing environmental constraints and anticipated environmental initiatives advanced by the environmental communities*

### **Fire Recommendations**

- *Fund and prepare a Countywide Fire Protection Master Plan*

- *Implement the GIMS program or other parcel based automated information system*
- *Clearly establish responsibilities and, where appropriate, timelines for the completion of policies and actions that will be included in the Updated General Plan*

#### Wind and Erosion Recommendations

- *Because of increasing concerns about air quality and clean water and due to the increased involvement of other agencies, any new and/or revised Wind/Erosion policies need to consider the tie between air quality and water quality and participation of other public jurisdictions*
- *Implement the Geographic Information Management System to complete the Wind/Erosion Hazard Overlay Maps*
- *Wind and erosion issues, actions, and policies should be fully integrated with the Conservation/Open Space and Safety components of the updated General Plan*

#### Noise Recommendations

- *Simplify and consolidate the number of noise policies related to street design, capital budgets, and procedural requirements*
- *Due to the lack of an all-inclusive County Noise Ordinance, prepare and adopt a Noise Ordinance consolidating all the related noise enforcement policies and standards that are contained throughout the County Code*
- *Implement a Countywide Geographic Information Management System to facilitate the implementation of a Noise Hazard Overlay mapping program*

#### Aviation Safety Recommendations

- *Because of the military air base closures, along with the elimination of their individual flight mission and related aircraft impacts, and the reassignment of airport land use compatibility review duties to the appropriate jurisdictions, the County should make the following policy changes:*
  1. *Consolidate and simplify policies relating to military air operational activities in the County*
  2. *Acknowledge the cities' assumption of their projects' airport land use compatibility review duties*
- *Describe the County's continuing airport planning role in the unincorporated portions of the County and the on-going coordination function with the cities with established Airport Land-Use Plans*
- *Incorporate the Aviation Safety policies into the Safety Element of the Updated General Plan*

### Hazardous Waste/Materials Recommendations

- *The County should focus its General Plan revisions on current state and federal legislative updates regarding hazardous waste materials*
- *Update County policies in keeping with the evolving hazardous waste/material industry*
- *Relocate policies written as mitigation measures to Development or Building Code*

### Biological Recommendations

- *Make a choice to pursue the valley-wide MSHCP, develop an alternative Natural Resources Management Program internal to County government, or revise the Natural Resources and applicable Open Space policies to meet the minimum legal requirements under the state and federal laws pertaining to protection of endangered species and their habitats, wetlands and other water-based resources, and related laws and regulations*
- *As part of Phase II, the County should examine how CEQA is used in this manner, the implications of this practice, and how the County will address these issues*
- *Revise the Conservation Element-based issues of the General Plan, including all policies and procedures, to reflect new direction based on the outcome of the previously described choice*
- *Complete a cost/benefit analysis based on the choice selected under the recommendation above. Comprehensively protecting natural resources can allow property owners and developers some relief from the individual permitting requirements that are currently preferred. However, the cost may be too severe or enforcement unrealistic. The successes and failures of similar efforts should be reviewed as part of the decision-making process*

### Cultural/Paleontological Recommendations

- *Conduct a cost/benefit assessment for the completion of the regional Cultural Resource Overlays*
- *Change reference to Appendix K of the State CEQA Guidelines to Section 15064.5, to reflect most current guidelines*

### Air Quality Recommendations

- *Examine incentivizing vs. regulating private choices regarding vehicular travel, land use patterns and energy conservation to achieve air quality objectives*
- *Remove Air Quality Element (optional under State law) from the General Plan*
- *Completely examine the County's Energy Conservation program. For example, consider a commitment to rely on or expand the use of non-polluting energy sources to power County facilities and set a specific goal for the percentage of the vehicle fleet comprised of clean fuel vehicles*

- *Examine density designations and creating sufficient population concentrations to make commuter rail viable*

#### Water Recommendations

- *Clarify the County's role in regional water resource management efforts, and develop corresponding programs to effectuate that role*
- *Develop and maintain program to link water supply planning to land use planning*
- *Develop and maintain a growth monitoring system that also tracks water demand*
- *Focus updated policies on those geographic areas, resources and facilities that the County has direct control over*
- *Develop policies and programs that are crafted for the unique characteristics and needs of the Mountains, Desert and Valley regions*

#### Open Space/Recreation/Scenic Recommendations

- *Simplify, consolidate and reduce the total number of policies*
- *Recreational trails and sign standards should be removed from the General Plan and given the same status as roadway design specifications*
- *Remove Section 3. Open Space Valuing System in its entirety. This could be utilized by the agencies within the Public Works Department as guidelines in the acquisition, maintenance, use, and disposal of County-owned open space lands*
- *Remove the listing and descriptions of the proposed regional trail segments. This can be more effectively addressed through a comprehensive update to the County's Regional Parks Master Plan that is adopted and administered separately from the General Plan*
- *Create current and updatable electronic maps to illustrate the major open space resource areas targeted for protection and public use*

#### Soils/Agriculture Recommendations

- *Eliminate obsolete policies to support continuation of the dairy industry in the Chino Preserve*
- *Re-examine County goals and policies regarding preservation of fertile soils designated as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. If there is a consensus to preserve such lands, much stronger policies, with formal monitoring and possibly financial incentives, will need to be developed and enforced*
- *Re-examine County goals and policies regarding establishment of new agricultural areas in the Desert region, and regarding stimulation of agricultural uses in areas that are appropriate for such uses, but are presently not utilized or are underutilized. Both issues involve a more central question of how proactive the County wants to be in stimulating the creation of new areas to support large-scale, commercially viable agricultural operations*



### Minerals Recommendation

- *Re-examine the level of interest in preserving mineral resources and revise General Plan policies accordingly*

### Wastewater Recommendations

- *Revisit septic tank issues and determine the proper entity for enforcing oversight and regulation policies*
- *Tighten relationship and policy direction for sludge maintenance and management. Determine facility need versus demand for disposal*
- *Re-examine specific County responsibilities for wastewater in light of Regional Water Quality Board and other, non-County agencies regulating water issues. Water quality MUST factor into wastewater considerations*

### Solid Waste Recommendations

- *Review County goals regarding landfill sites and all related issues to better define purpose of expanding facilities when direction is to reduce flow to the sites*
- *Integrate sludge issues, including dairy sludge with water quality, wastewater issues. All agencies involved with sludge should understand the relationships and functions of each other for all aspects of sludge removal, disposal, handling and maintenance*
- *Continue to press for up to 100% diversion of materials to landfills*

### Transportation/Circulation Recommendations

- *Review, update and refine/modify the Policies/Actions indicated to be carried forward to the General Plan Update*
- *Strengthen the relationship between the Transportation/Circulation Element and the Land Use Element, in order to achieve closer integration*
- *Evaluate the practicality, desirability, and economic feasibility of the Level of Service C standard, and consider changing to a Level of Service D standard*
- *Eliminate the detailed roadway design standards. Include general County policies and refer to County standards in the Roadway Design Manual*
- *Update with the latest Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Circulation Management Plan (CMP) requirements*
- *Address truck movement in the County*
- *Continue to differentiate between key geographic areas in the County (Valley, Desert, Mountains), due to the diverse needs of the different areas*
- *The GPU should conduct an analysis to confirm that the Circulation Element provides the transportation infrastructure necessary to support the County Land Use Plan and policies, and/or develop a Circulation Element that does. This analysis should utilize the SCAG subregional model which may need updating/enhancing for the General Plan Update*

### Energy/Telecommunications Recommendations

- *Remove technical siting criteria (e.g. JUMP) from General Plan*
- *Energy Conservation policies are regulatory and should be relocated to the County Development Code or the Building Code*
- *Establish public/private partnerships to enhance energy related economic development opportunities*

### Land Use/Growth Management Recommendations

- *Form a General Plan Staff Advisory Committee of the highest level under the direction of the County Chief Administrative Officer to provide input and guidance throughout the preparation of the Updated General Plan*
- *One of the first and highest priorities should be to prepare a Vision Statement with the input received from a broad and extensive public outreach program and from input from the Staff Advisory Committee, which should then guide further work on the Update*
- *Strengthen Growth Management as a means of achieving better planning and as an economic stimulus technique*
- *The Geographic Information Management System (GIMS) should be implemented immediately as increasing urbanization creates new sets of issues, environmental and other constraints on individual properties multiply, the need for efficiency at the County level grows, and because providing information, quickly and accurately, to the public is both important and expected*